DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 549 JC 800 040

AUTHOR McIntyre, Chuck
TITLE Center for the Improvement of Instruction.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE 25 Jan 80
NOTE 17p.: Paper prepared for the Meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Los Angeles, CA, January 25, 1980)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Clearinghouses: College Faculty: Community Colleges: Enrollment Trends: Faculty Development: Financial Support: *Instructional Improvement: *Junior Colleges: Networks: Newsletters: Professional Continuing Education: Program Administration: Program Evaluation: Resource Allocations: *Staff Improvement: State Programs: *Statewide Planning: *Teacher Centers: Teacher Exchange Programs: Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

In response to the need for the continual development of those directly involved in the instruction of community college students, a Center for the Improvement of Instruction has been proposed that would be utilized by the staff of all 106 California community colleges. The objectives, programs, organization, and funding of this proposed center are described in this report. First, the demographic changes expected of community college students during the 1980's and increasing pressure for cost effectiveness are discussed as they relate to the need for a centralized, multi-institutional center for the continuing education of instructional staff. The goals and objectives of the center and participants are then outlined. Subsequently, the center's programs and activities are discussed. These will include: (1) provision of short- or long-term networks among staff groups with shared goals; (2) creation of a clearinghouse for the dissemination of information on instructional materials and media: (3) coordination of staff and professional development efforts with an institution's particular needs: (4) establishment of workshops and a newsletter: (5) provision of advice on technical instructional matters: (6) provision of an intercollege instructor exchange: and (7) establishment of a fellows program. The report then considers the administration and evaluation of the center and funding alternatives. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED180549

CENTER FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION

Chuck McIntyre
Director
Analytical Studies

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gerald C. Hayward

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 800 040

Paper prepared for the Meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, Los Angeles.

January 25, 1980

Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges
January 25, 1980

Item 4

Title: Center for the Improvement of Instruction

Staff presentation: Chuck McIntyre, Director
Analytical Studies

Summary

1. The need for continual development of faculty and others directly involved in the instruction of community college students has long been recognized. However, the lack of college resources for faculty and general staff development prevents colleges from fulfilling this need.

2. This item describes a proposed Center for the Improvement of Instruction: its objectives, program, organization, and funding.

3. The basic goal of the Center is to enhance the quality of the learning experience for students. This goal would be accomplished by an organized effort to develop those community college staff directly involved in instruction.

4. One of several alternative organizations for the Center is proposed by staff. If approved by the Board in February and if efforts at securing the necessary funding are successful, Center programs and activities could begin by the end of 1980.

BACKGROUND

Need

The need for continual development of faculty and others directly involved in the instruction of community college students has long been recognized. However, the lack of college resources for faculty and general staff development prevents colleges from fulfilling this need. The Board of Governors' 1979-84 Five-Year Plan highlighted this problem in a policy paper. This paper noted that fewer than a dozen of the 70 districts had organized staff development offices and that very few districts had what could be described as adequate staff development programs. Budget cutback following Proposition 13 have further reduced staff development activities.

The changing demographics of community college students during the 1970's is expected to continue during the 1980's and lead to one of the most diverse student bodies in all of postsecondary education. There will be a continuing shift to older students as the general population itself becomes older and as more adults return to college for retraining and personal improvement. This suggests a possible increase in the proportion of part-time students who now comprise seven of ten college enrollments. The recent trend of increased enrollment of women is likely to continue. The proportion of racial and ethnic minorities (now three of ten students) also is likely to increase as the proportion of minorities in the general population increases. Likewise, the number and proportion of handicapped students is expected to increase. This is quite a different situation than existed one or two decades ago. There is also evidence that entering students are less prepared for college than were their counterparts of a decade or two ago.

In contrast to this changing student profile, faculty are relatively stable. Teachers who began their careers one or two decades ago taught, at that time, a far more homogeneous group of students who apparently were better prepared. These faculty could benefit from developmental programs designed to help them deal with a very different group of students.

The total enrollment picture for community colleges during the 1980's is mixed. Systemwide, enrollments are expected to be about 12 percent greater by the end of the decade than at present. However, current estimates project about half of Califonria's districts facing fewer enrollments during the latter half of the next decade than during the first half of the decade. Indeed, enrollment in over twenty districts declined this fall for the second and, in several cases, the third consecutive year.

Moderate increases or decreases in enrollment mean moderate additions or decreases in teaching staff. As enrollment (and revenue) declines, a district may initially cut back by not rehiring part-time faculty. This continues until the number of part-time faculty is reduced such that full-time contract faculty are asked to assume duties formerly carried out by the part-timers. This could mean, for example, that full-time faculty members who formerly taught their discipline to young, full-time students during the day are not teaching that same discipline to older, part-time students in the evening. Or, some faculty may even need to teach in related or other disciplines. This scenario is a gross over-

simplification, but does suggest the need for developmental programs that enable faculty to deal more effectively with significant changes in their instructional responsibilities; changes brought about by enrollment decline.

Proposition 13, the AB 8 revenue cap, income tax indexing, a dwindling state General Fund surplus, a possibly successful initiative halving the state income tax, and a likely slowing of the state's economic activity (and lowered inflation rate) will result in relatively fewer tax revenues being available for community college operations during the 1980's than was the case in the past decade. Consequently, there will need to be more effective use of community college resources in delivering post-secondary education to Californians if equal opportunity for access is to continue as the community colleges' primary goal. Staff are the primary college resource, accounting for more than four-fifths of budgeted expenditures. It is imperative, therefore, that opportunities be made available for developing and improving the quality of this, the college's most important resource. Indeed, better utilization of staff, particularly faculty, is the primary means of making California Community Colleges more cost-effective.

These factors will result in a need to devote relatively more college resources to staff development and retraining in the future. The level of existing college resources for staff development is inadequate. This situation is not likely to improve because of existing and anticipated fiscal constraints on the growth of district budgets. Consequently, a new vehicle such as an institute or center for developmental activities with alternative funding appears to be the most, perhaps the only, effective solution to this problem.

Existing Efforts

(Discussion to be added - with Appendix - about faculty development efforts in the community colleges, in other segments of postsecondary education in California, and in other states.)

Proposals

The specific idea of an institute or center for the improvement of instruction in California Community Colleges began with interest expressed by the Academic Senate, other faculty groups, and the advisory committee of the Fund for Instructional Improvement. Interest continued with discussions between college faculty and former Chancellor William Craig in the spring of 1979. Following these discussions several papers were written on the topic and Chancellor's Office Analytical Studies Unit staff initiated a project in the summer of 1979 to analyze and design such an effort. Staff have been assisted by a task force of college faculty, staff development personnel, trustees, students, and administrators in the development of the project. (See Task Force membership in Appendix A.)

This proposal completes the first phase of that project. If the Board approves the proposal, Chancellor's Office staff will proceed to secure the necessary statutory changes and continue further development work this spring. If these efforts are successful, the Center should be organized and staffed by late summer or early fall and programs and activities begin by the end of 1980.

This item describes the following aspects of a proposed Center for the Improvement of Instruction:

goals and objectives
programs and activities
organization and staffing
evaluation
finance

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Mission of the Center

The mission of the Center is to enhance the quality of the learning experience for students. The Center will promote excellence in instruction through an orgainized effort to develop those community college staff directly involved in instruction.

This mission will be accomplished by the goals and objectives of the Center. The ***goals of the Center*** are to:

- Facilitate the continuing improvement and development of instruction in the California Community Colleges by organizing and conducting a variety of programs and activities.
- Provide opportunities for training in the application and evaluation of alternative instructional systems.
- Increase awareness of and sensitivity to the learning needs of an increasingly diverse student constituency.
- Identify and address specific issues and problems in instruction.
- Involve a broad representation of colleges and disciplines by creating an instructional improvement system that will reach all local instructional personnel.

There are two sets of objectives, one for the Center and its operation and a second for the Center's participants.

Objectives for the Center are to:

- Offer activities designed to increase awareness of and sensitivity to the learning needs of a culturally and demographically diverse student clientele.

* Sponsor ongoing workshops, seminars, conferences, Fellows Programs, and other activities based on assessment of needs.

* Develop human networks for exchange of ideas, teaching materials and other instructional information among community college faculty.

* Gather, house, and disseminate relevant educational materials developed by participants and others.

Objectives for the participants are to:

* Increase instructional competencies through participation in discussions and demonstrations and in an intellectually stimulating environment.

* Propose and disseminate solutions to acute problems or (master) issues of community college instruction, both in terms of general concern and as it relates to the participant's teaching area.

* Analyze existing instructional methods in order to identify personal strengths and weaknesses in instruction.

* Develop and exchange instructional materials, methods, and support systems.

* Become knowledgeable about the types and uses of new media and technology.

* Expand knowledge of or competency in the participant's subject matter field(s) and related disciplines.

* Become resource persons ready to share expertise on a local and state level, when requested.

* Participate in activities that would increase awareness of a diverse student population.

PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

To achieve its goals and objectives, the Center will offer a variety of staff development programs and activities. The needs to which the Center will address itself are varied. Thus, programs and activities will vary in focus, format, process, and duration. Programs and activities will be determined by a Board of Directors and staff, establishing priorities from multi-faceted, ongoing needs assessments and preferences of community college faculty and other staff involved with instruction.Assessments will include, but not be limited to, techniques such as surveys, interviews, and analyses of available data. Needs identified by such assessments should represent local and stateside concerns, and be used to select topics for various workshops, seminars, symposia, or other appropriate activities.

To the extent possible, Center programs and activities would be "taken to" participants throughout the state and presented through the latest communications technology, rather than having participants travel to a "center" in all cases.

Center programs and activities can be described in several categories: networking, clearinghouse/dissemination, coordination, delivery, technical assistance, instructor exchange, and Fellows Programs.

Networking

From time to time, needs arise which can be addressed effectively by the quick convening of groups of persons sharing an interest and/or expertise in that need. Such a group can take the organizational form of a network, meaning that each individual is linked to the other by:

* a shared concern
* a means and process for communication
* shared goals

The Center will facilitate the creation of networks, be they of short or long duration, by providing contracts, linking people, and developing the process for communication.

Clearinghouse/Dissemination

The Center will collect and disseminate information on instructional materials and media (print and nonprint): a data bank of teacher-recommended materials, program and course development, projects such as those funded under AB 1173, and other similar efforts across the country that are designed to improve instruction in community colleges.

Coordination

The Center will identify staff and professional development efforts throughout California, compare them with instructional needs, and match these available activities with teacher or college requests for development programs.

Delivery

The Center will stage workshops and seminars, provide consultants (Fellows Program), and publish newsletters.

Technical Assistance

The Center will advise local community colleges on staff development and on technical instructional matters such as, for example, requirements for setting up learning systems: space and human resource utilization, hardware and software purchases.

Instructor Exchange

The Center will develop and coordinate an instructor exchange program. Besides intercollege exchange, this program would include providing opportunities for college staff to become involved in programs in business, industry, labor, and government.

Fellows Program

The Fellows Program is a special curriculum designed to resolve critical issues related to community college instruction. This involves analyzing the full implications of a given issue, researching alternatives, and arriving at a workable, cost-effective solution. This solution would be presented to community college instructional personnel throughout the state for possible implementation. Presentations would take the form of published papers, seminars, workshops, clinics, and the like.

Each semester, community college personnel directly involved in instruction will be able to apply for the Fellows Program. Fellows will be selected by the Board of Directors for each semester's study. The process involves local recommendation and Center selection.

In order to be Fellows, applicants must obtain approval of a college committee on instructional improvement. The Fellowship would require the participant to be on a full-time leave during the Fellowsship term, a full semester, or quarter. The Fellows will have continuity of salary, benefits, job security, and accumulation of seniority and/or longevity rights during their term with the Center.

Fellows will meet as a group at a central location for a week at the beginning of their term to plan subsequent meetings, research strategies, and visits to learning sites, and return to the in home campus when appropriate for study and/or application of their findings.

During their term, Fellows participate in a four-phased curriculum including a "core" curriculum study of a master issue, involvement in an individual project, and dissemination planning. After their term, they remain a Fellow. The expectation is that they will be a part of an ever-increasing cadre of persons committed to instructional improvement and skilled in dissemination and change. The cadre of Fellows will be listed in a directory and be available for consultation, networking, and as resource persons. As the list of Fellows lengthens, year after year, and the number of persons influenced by Fellows increases, a "multiplier" effect is expected to extend and amplify the effect of instructional development.

ORGANIZATION AND BUDGET

Four alternative models for Center organization were examined by the Task Force. Each model varies as to staff, location of authority, cost, and results. Common to all models, however, is a Board of Directors of the Center to assess needs and set policies and priorities for Center functioning. Also common to each model are twenty participants in the Fellows Program and basic levels of activity for other Center programs and functions. (These models are described in Appendix B.)

Recommended Alternative

Staff recommends an alternative ("D" in Appendix B) which has a small staff and local college committees to advise on programs and select participants. This alternative has both focus and continuity with three permanent central staff together with strong college-level participation. Three aspects of the recommended Center organization need elaboration: the policy board, local faculty committees, and staffing.

The Center Board should be made up primarily of faculty and students in view of the basic purpose of all Center efforts: improving instruction. This suggests a ten-person Board with nine voting members.

five	faculty
two	students
one	trustee
one	administrator
one	Chancellor (ex officio)

Center Board members could be selected by the Board of Governors upon recommendation of appropriate constituency groups and each Board member would have a designated alternate. Initial terms would be staggered and three years in duration thereafter. The Center Board would meet several times per year (perhaps quarterly) to set Center policy and priorities and the Board would appoint any and all consultants necessary to fully explore instructional issues. A Board chairperson would be elected by the Board.

A strong college-level structure, related to Center activities, is necessary in order to (a) provide for peer selection of participants and (b) effectively gather and submit ideas about the character of Center programs. This local structure can be accomplished by establishing a committee for instructional improvement at each of the 106 colleges. This committee would represent the Academic Senate or where local bargaining units exist, represent both the Senate and appropriate bargaining unit(s).

The Center staff would consist of a director, one center associate, and a secretary. The director of the Center would carry out policies set by the Center Board by initiating, implementing, and managing programas and activities. The director would also give direction to the Board by informing them of program needs. Other functions of the director include supervising staff and overseeing the systems of records and accountability. Center associate's duties would include advising participants in the Fellows Programs, coordinating responses to needs assessments, disseminating information, (both print and non-print), and conducting training programs.

The director and secretary would be employed as permanent staff of the Center, buth the Center associates may change from year to year. Their employment, then, would be based on currect needs and objectives of the Center. The participants in the Fellows Program have the potential of becoming adjunct faculty after their Fellowship terms. As adjunct faculty of the Center, they would function as network linkers, consultants, and mentors for the Center.

Location

In view of its purpose, the most conducive physical location for the Center would appear to be at an institution, preferably at a host community college.

This host college could also act as the fiscal agent for the Center. Use of a college foundation might well facilitate Center operations. The location needn't be permanent; host colleges could change periodically to provide broader geographic coverage.

EVALUATION

The Center will be committed to regular and rigorous evaluations. Formative and summative evaluations will be conducted by both external evaluators and by Center personnel, as called for by the Center Board. External evaluation will also be dictated to an extent by the character of funding secured.

The importance of this project and the state funding (from AB 1173) involved suggest that staff development is likely to be one of the statewide objectives referred to in the recent Board agenda item on Integrating and Implementing Policy Decisions (Item 8, December 1979). If this is the case, then activities of the Center would be subject to an annual evaluation during the planning process to be implemented by the Board of Governors. In addition, if other funding is secured, each of the funding agencies will doubtless require evaluations unique to their own needs.

Evaluative information can include quantitative data such as number of participants in Center activities, scope of dissemination, extent of networking, and other specific cost-effectiveness measures. Information for qualitative measures might be obtained from participant self-reports, appraisals of Center products, the judgment of informed observers, and studies of the impact on instruction attributable to Center activities.

It is suggested that there be a major specific evaluation of the Center by the Board of Governors after three years of operation. This would occur during the fourth year with support of the Center in the fifth year contingent upon a successful evaluation.

FUNDING

The Center should have stable base funding for continuity from year to year, and could benefit from a variety of additional sources in order to expand its activities. Possible funding sources include:

State
- Fund for Instructional Improvement (AB 1173)
- Grants
- Loans
- New General Fund Appropriation

Federal
- Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE)
- Others such as NSF, National Endowment for Humanities, etc.

Private

Foundations such as Kellogg, Exxon, etc.
Participant fees where appropriate

Local

Explicit contributions from budgets of local colleges by way of release time, travel expenses and the like.

Use of AB 1173 monies appears appropriate, timely, and more certain than attempting to secure a new state General Fund appropriation.

There is little question that the purposes of the Center would be consistent with the purposes for AB 1173 (Fund for Instructional Improvement) and the Title 5, Administrative Code, regulations adopted by the Board of Governors in order to properly implement the legislation.

There are indications that the Center would represent a better use of AB 1173 funds than a large number of small projects which aggregate to the same total portion of the fund. After two year of funding, projects submitted to the Fund are becoming somewhat repetitious. In addition, most projects are cut significantly below proposed levels so that they fall within Title 5 guidelines and overall funding. Further, efforts at disseminating the results of projects have not always been successful. Finally, even though "programs for improving teaching abilities of faculty members ..." and other programs analogous to the staff development activities of the proposed Center are all eligible, relatively few such projects have been proposed and funded.

If AB 1173 grants were to fund Center staff, Board expenses, and certain basic programs and activities, then AB 1173 loan funds along with federal and private funds could be sought for the Fellow Program and additional Center activities. Participants' fees would appear appropriate in a limited number of instances. Likewise, local college contributions should be encouraged but not required as a major source of support if the Center is to be successful. In particular, it is suggested that districts be reimbursed for the released time of Fellows or other faculty who may be involved with the Center on more than just a one or several-day or casual basis.

APPENDIX A

TASK FORCE ON THE
CENTER FOR THE
IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION

Delores Benton
District Coordinator,
Handicapped Programs
Peralta Community College District

Robert S. Bolan
Director, Governmental Affairs
Los Angeles Community College
District

Ernie Berg
Associate Executive Director
California Community and Junior
College Association

Chester H. Case, Jr.
Dean, Social & Economic Studies
Los Medanos College

Evie Cogley
Faculty Member
Sierra College

Edith Conn
Faculty Member
Ventura College

Kathleen Conrey
Faculty Member
El Camino College

Richard Estrada
Student
Indian Valley College

Tony Gilleran
Faculty Member
Santa Barbara City College

James Hatfield
Trustee
Sierra Community College District

Marguarite Jones
Staff Development
Sacramento City College

James Lucas
Staff Development
DeAnza College

Chuck McIntyre
Director, Analytical Studies Unit
Chancellor's Office

Tom Padilla
Student
Mt. San Antonio College

Leonard Shymoniak
Research Specialist
Chancellor's Office

Carolyn Wiley
Student Intern
Chancellor's Office

Altha Williams
Dean of Administrative Services
San Diego City College

APPENDIX B

ALTERNATIVE ORGANIZATIONS
CENTER FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION

NOTE: The following describes four alternative organizational patterns for the Center. Staff recommends Alternative D as having the potential to be the most effective of the four.

Alternatives

A: DECENTRALIZED $ 705,000 Annually

Authority in this model is focused in five regional directors (paid staff) each supervising a set of faculty "chairs." Central staff is confined to a Secretary.

This model facilitates the convening of regional efforts, caters to local or regional needs, and should avoid rigid and routine efforts. The focus is however, regional, not local (in the sense of being campus-based), and may be difficult to coordinate.

B: CENTRALIZED $ 645,000 Annually

This model has a large central staff made up of a Director, four Associates, and Secretary. Results are focused and there is a high degree of accountability and continuity. There may not always be the most accurate response to local needs, however.

Thus, on the one hand, the centralized professional staff provides a focus, a degree of coordination and control not present in the other models. On the other hand, efforts could be rigid, not necessarily consistent with local preferences, and there is some potential for a "bureaucracy" to develop, possibly to the detriment of delivering effective programs.

C: AD HOC $ 470,000 Annually

This model is staffed by a Secretary, similar to model A, but relies totally upon ad hoc groups to accomplish various Center objectives. It is very flexible and involves local personnel. Activities, particularly dissemination of results, would be limited.

There is less structure in this model than the others, little overhead, and, likely, a more rapid response to local preferences than in ther other models. However, initiation of ad hoc groups, coordination of duplicate activities, and accountability for results are all serious problems. Further, it is doubtful that the Center effort could be successfully initiated without more permanent staff.

D: COMPROMISE $ 575,000 Annually

This model approach has a central staff, similar to model B, but with two major exceptions. First, there are two, rather than four, Associates on staff. Second, there is a committee at each college to provide program input and to select participants.

While less expensive than either models A or B, this model has local input (supported by the college) and sufficient Center staff to initiate programs, maintain continuity, and ensure some degree of accountability.

CHART OF ALTERNATIVE MODELS FOR CENTER

	ALTERNATIVE A: DECENTRALIZED	ALTERNATIVE B: CENTRALIZED	ALTERNATIVE C: AD HOC	ALTERNATIVE D: COMPROMISE
STAFF	Secretary 5 Regional Directors Fellows Regional Chairs	Director Secretary 4 Associates Fellows	Secretary Fellows Adhoc Groups	Director Secretary Associate Fellows College Committees
POLICY				
FORMULATION	Board	Board	Board	Board
IMPLEMENT	Regional Directors & Chairs	Director & Staff	AdHoc Groups	Director, Staff, College Committees
PROGRAM				
OVERVIEW	Board	Board	Board	Board
CONTINUITY	Regional Directors	Director & Staff	AdHoc Groups	Director, Staff, College Committees
COST				
BOARD	$ 25,000	$ 25,000	$ 25,000	$ 25,000
STAFF	240,000	215,000	25,000	107,000
OFFICE	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
LOCAL GROUPS	35,000	0	15,000	38,000
PROGRAMS	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
FELLOWS	275,000	275,000	275,000	275,000
TOTAL	$705,000	$645,000	$470,000	$575,000

ILLUSTRATIVE BUDGET FOR
ALTERNATIVE D

1.	STAFF		
	Secretary	$ 15,000	
	Director	40,000	
	Associates	30,000	
		$ 85,000	
	Benefits	22,000 (25%)	
2.	OFFICE	$ 30,000	
3.	BOARD	$ 25,000	
4.	LOCAL COMMITTEES	$ 38,000	
5.	PROGRAMS	$100,000	
	(Networking Clearinghouse/Dissemination Coordination Delivery Technical Assistance Instructor Exchange)		
	Basic Staff & Programs	$300,000	$ 300,000
6.	FELLOWS PROGRAM		
	20 @ $10,000	$200,000	
	Expenses	75,000	
			$ 275,000
	TOTAL		$ 575,000

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

FEB 22 1980